UNITED
NATIONS

A

General Assembly

Distr.
GENERAL

A/C.6/51/6
11 November 1996

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

Fifty-first session
SIXTH COMMITTEE
Agenda item 151

MEASURES TO ELIMINATE INTERNATIONAL TERRORISM

Letter dated 1 November 1996 from the Permanent Representative of India to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

I have the honour to refer to agenda item 151 of the fifty-first session of the General Assembly and to state that the Government of India has prepared a draft international convention on the suppression of terrorism for consideration by Member States (see annex).

It is requested that the present letter and its annex be circulated as a document of the General Assembly under agenda item 151.

(Signed) Prakash SHAH
Permanent Representative

96-31499 (E) 141196

ANNEX

Draft international convention on the suppression of terrorism

The States Parties to this Convention,

Recalling the existing international conventions relating to various aspects of the problem of international terrorism,

Recalling also General Assembly resolution 49/60 of 9 December 1994 and the Declaration on Measures to Eliminate International Terrorism annexed thereto,

Deeply concerned about the worldwide escalation of acts of terrorism in all forms, which endanger or take innocent lives, jeopardize fundamental freedoms and seriously impair the dignity of human beings,

Reaffirming their unequivocal condemnation of all acts, methods and practices of terrorism as criminal and unjustifiable, wherever and by whomever committed, including those which jeopardize friendly relations among States and peoples and threaten the territorial integrity and security of States,

Recognizing that acts, methods and practices of terrorism constitute a grave violation of the purposes and principles of the United Nations, which may pose a threat to international peace and security, jeopardize friendly relations among States, hinder international cooperation and aim at the undermining of human rights, fundamental freedoms and the democratic basis of society,

Recognizing also that the financing, planning and inciting of terrorist acts are also contrary to the purposes and principles of the United Nations, and that it is the duty of the Contracting Parties to bring to justice those who have participated in such terrorist acts,

Convinced that the suppression of acts of international terrorism, including those in which States are directly or indirectly involved, is an essential element for the maintenance of international peace and security, and the sovereignty and territorial integrity of States,

Realizing the need to develop further a comprehensive legal framework of conventions dealing with international terrorism,

Have resolved to take effective measures to ensure that perpetrators of terrorist acts do not escape prosecution and punishment by providing for their extradition or prosecution, and to that end have agreed as follows:

Article 1

The Contracting States undertake to cooperate among themselves by taking all the measures that they may consider effective, under their own laws, and in

particular those established pursuant to this Convention, to prevent and punish acts of terrorism, especially those referred to in article 2 of this Convention.

Article 2

1. The Contracting States shall ensure that their national laws recognize that criminal acts intended or calculated to provoke a state of terror in the general public, a group of persons or particular persons for political purposes are under any circumstances unjustifiable, whatever the considerations of a political, philosophical, ideological, racial, ethnic, religious or any other nature that may be invoked to justify them.

2. In particular, for purposes of extradition between Contracting States, none of the following offences shall be regarded as a political offence or as an offence connected with a political offence or as an offence inspired by political motives:

(a) An offence within the scope of the Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Seizure of Aircraft, signed at The Hague on 16 December 1970;

(b) An offence within the scope of the Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Civil Aviation, signed at Montreal on 23 September 1971;

(c) An offence within the scope of the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of Crimes against Internationally Protected Persons, including Diplomatic Agents, adopted by the General Assembly on 14 December 1973; 1/

(d) An offence within the scope of the International Convention against the Taking of Hostages, signed at New York on 17 December 1979; 2/

(e) Murder, manslaughter or assault causing serious bodily harm, kidnapping or serious unlawful detention;

(f) An offence involving the use of firearms, weapons, explosives or other dangerous substances when used as a means to perpetrate indiscriminate violence involving death or serious bodily injury to persons or serious damage to property;

(g) An attempt to commit any of the foregoing offences or participation as an accomplice of a person who commits or attempts to commit such an offence.

1/ Resolution 3166 (XXVIII), annex.

2/ Resolution 34/146, annex.

Article 3

1. The Contracting States shall refrain from organizing, instigating, facilitating, financing, assisting or participating in the commission of terrorist offences, in particular those referred to in article 2, in the territories of other States, or acquiescing in or encouraging or tolerating activities within their territories directed towards the commission of such offences.

2. The Contracting States shall also take practical measures to ensure that their respective territories are not used for terrorist installations and training camps or for the preparation or organization of terrorist acts, in particular those referred to in article 2, intended to be committed against other States or their citizens.

3. The Contracting States shall take appropriate measures, before granting asylum for the purpose of ensuring that the asylum seeker has not engaged in terrorist activities, in particular those referred to in article 2, and, after granting asylum, for the purpose of ensuring that refugee status is not used in a manner contrary to the provisions of this Convention.

4. Towards this end, the Contracting States shall cooperate in preventing and punishing the crimes referred to in article 2 of this Convention. The Contracting States shall further:

(a) Take all measures within their power, in conformity with the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations and other relevant rules of international law, to prevent and impede the preparation in their respective territories of the crimes referred to in article 2 that are to be carried out in the territory of another Contracting State;

(b) Engage in systematic exchange of information and consider effective implementation of relevant international conventions, including the harmonization of their domestic legislation with those conventions, and conclusion of mutual judicial assistance and extradition agreements on a bilateral or regional basis and other measures for the purpose of combating offences referred to in article 2 of this Convention;

(c) Include in their penal laws, if not already so included, the criminal acts contemplated in this Convention;

(d) Comply most expeditiously with requests for extradition and mutual judicial assistance concerning the criminal acts contemplated in this Convention on the basis of existing arrangements or agreements, or, in their absence, on the basis of this Convention.

5. The Contracting States shall guarantee to every person deprived of his freedom through the application of this Convention every right to defend himself.

Article 4

1. The Contracting State in whose territory the alleged offender is found shall, if it does not extradite him, be obliged, without exception whatsoever and whether or not the offence was committed in its territory, to submit the case to its competent authorities for the purpose of prosecution through proceedings in accordance with the laws of that State. Those authorities shall take their decision in the same manner as in the case of any ordinary offence of a grave nature under the law of that State.

2. Any person regarding whom proceedings are being brought in connection with any of the offences referred to in article 2 shall be guaranteed fair treatment at all stages of the proceedings, including enjoyment of all the rights and guarantees provided by the law of the State in the territory in which he is present.

Article 5

1. Contracting States shall afford one another the widest measure of mutual judicial assistance in criminal matters in connection with proceedings brought in respect of the offences referred to in article 2. The law of the requested State concerning mutual assistance in criminal matters shall apply in all cases. Nevertheless, this assistance may not be refused on the sole ground that it concerns a political offence or an offence committed with a political offence or an offence inspired by political motives.

2. The provisions of paragraph 1 of this article shall not affect obligations concerning mutual judicial assistance embodied in any other treaty.

Article 6

The Contracting State where the alleged offender is prosecuted in accordance with its laws shall communicate the final outcome of the proceedings to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, who shall transmit the information to the other States concerned and the international intergovernmental organizations concerned.

Article 7

1. The offences referred to in article 2 shall be deemed to be included as extraditable offences in any extradition treaty existing between Contracting States. The Contracting States undertake to include such offences as extraditable offences in every extradition treaty to be concluded between them.

2. If a Contracting State that makes extradition conditional on the existence of a treaty receives a request for extradition from another Contracting State with which it has no extradition treaty, the requested State may at its option consider this Convention as the legal basis for extradition in

respect of the offences referred to in article 2. Extradition shall be subject to the other conditions provided for by the law of the requested State.

3. The Contracting States that do not make extradition conditional on the existence of a treaty shall recognize the offences referred to in article 2 as extraditable offences between themselves subject to the conditions provided for by the law of the requested State.

4. The offences referred to in article 1 shall be treated, for the purpose of extradition between Contracting States, as if they shall had been committed not only in the place in which they occurred but also in the territories of the requested States.

Article 8

1. Each Contracting State shall take such measures as may be necessary to establish its jurisdiction over the crimes referred to in article 2 in the following cases:

(a) When the crime is committed in the territory of that State or on board a ship or aircraft registered in that State;

(b) When the alleged offender is a national of that State or by a person who has his habitual residence in its territory.

2. A Contracting State may also establish its jurisdiction over any such crime when it is committed:

(a) By a stateless person whose habitual residence is in that State; or

(b) With respect to a national of that State; or

(c) In an attempt to compel that State to do or to abstain from doing any act.

3. Any Contracting State that has established jurisdiction as referred to in paragraph 2 shall notify the Secretary-General of the United Nations. If such a Contracting State subsequently rescinds that jurisdiction, it shall notify the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

4. Each Contracting State shall take such measures as may be necessary to establish its jurisdiction over the crimes referred to in article 2 in cases where the alleged offender is present in its territory and where it does not extradite such a person to any of the Contracting States that have established their jurisdiction in accordance with paragraphs 1 or 2.

5. This Convention does not exclude any criminal jurisdiction exercised in accordance with national law.

Article 9

1. Any dispute between two or more States Parties concerning the interpretation of application of this Convention shall be settled by negotiation. If the Parties failed to settle the dispute within six months, any one of those Parties may refer the dispute to the International Court of Justice by application in conformity with the Statute of the Court.

2. Each Contracting Party may at the time of signature, ratification, acceptance or approval of this Convention or accession thereto declare that it does not consider itself bound by all or part of paragraph 1 of this article. The other Contracting Parties shall not be bound by paragraph 1 or the relevant part thereof with respect to any Contracting Party that has made such a reservation.

3. Any Contracting Party that has made a reservation in accordance with paragraph 2 of this article may at any time withdraw that reservation by notification to the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

Article 10

At the request of one or more Contracting Parties, and if approved by the majority of Contracting Parties, the Secretary-General of the United Nations shall convene a meeting of the Contracting Parties to review the implementation of the Convention and any problems encountered with regard to its application.

Article 11

1. This Convention is open for signature by all States, until _____, at United Nations Headquarters in New York.

2. This Convention is subject to ratification. The instruments of ratification shall be deposited with the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

3. This Convention is open for accession by any State. The instruments of accession shall be deposited with the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

Article 12

This Convention is subject to ratification, acceptance or approval. Instruments of ratification, acceptance or approval shall be deposited with the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

Article 13

This Convention shall be open for accession by any State. The instruments of accession shall be deposited with the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

Article 14

1. This Convention shall enter into force thirty days after twenty-two instruments of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession have been deposited with the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

2. For each State ratifying or acceding to the Convention after the deposit of the twenty-second instrument of ratification or accession, the Convention shall enter into force on the thirtieth day after deposit by such State of its instrument of ratification or accession.

Article 15

1. A Contracting State may denounce this Convention by written notification to the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

2. Denunciation shall take effect one year following the date on which notification is received by the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

Article 16

The original of this Convention, of which the Arabic, Chinese, English, French, Russian and Spanish texts are equally authentic, shall be deposited with the Secretary-General of the United Nations, who shall send certified copies thereof to all States.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the undersigned, being duly authorized thereto by their respective Governments, have signed this Convention, opened for signature at _____ on _____ 199 .

UNITED
NATIONS

A

General Assembly

Distr.
GENERAL

A/C.6/51/7
12 November 1996

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

Fifty-first session
SIXTH COMMITTEE
Agenda item 120

HUMAN RESOURCES MANAGEMENT

Letter dated 12 November 1996 from the Chairman of the Sixth Committee to the President of the General Assembly

I have the honour to attach a communication from the Sixth Committee regarding agenda item 120, Human resources management, which was allocated by the General Assembly to the Fifth Committee on the understanding that the Sixth Committee would examine the legal implications of the proposals of the Secretary-General contained in his reports on the reform of the internal system of justice in the Secretariat (see annex).

(Signed) Ramón ESCOVAR-SALOM
Chairman,
Sixth Committee
of the General Assembly

ANNEX

Communication from the Sixth Committee regarding the legal implications of the reform of the internal system of justice of the Secretariat (agenda item 120)

Reference is made to agenda item 120, Human resources management, which was allocated by the General Assembly to the Fifth Committee on the understanding that the Sixth Committee would examine the legal implications of the proposals of the Secretary-General contained in his reports on the reform of the internal system of justice in the Secretariat.

The Sixth Committee discussed the item at its 7th meeting, on 30 September, and its 9th meeting, on 1 October 1996. At the 7th meeting, the Under-Secretary-General for Administration and Management presented the proposals, mentioning that there was widespread dissatisfaction with the existing system of justice, which had been established many years earlier and was inadequate in current circumstances. The proposals were aimed at achieving a just, transparent, simple, impartial and efficient system. He referred to measures to promote early reconciliation of disputes and to professionalize the consideration of appeals and disciplinary cases. He spoke of the proposals to replace the Joint Appeals Board by an arbitration board and the Joint Disciplinary Committee by a disciplinary board and mentioned that a limited number of administrative measures had already been introduced.

After this presentation, the Under-Secretary-General and the Deputy to the Legal Counsel made themselves available for a question and answer session. Questions were posed by 10 delegations on such matters as the legal basis of the proposals; what other reforms had been considered; whether staff members would have a choice between different procedures in the early stage; the method of appointment of arbitrators and their status; the status of disciplinary board members; the likely effect of centralization of the system with regard to delays in procedures; and what action had been taken to avoid misunderstandings between staff members and their supervisors.

Following the presentation and the question and answer session, the proposals were debated at the 9th meeting of the Committee, on 1 October. There were nine interventions in the debate, including one made during the 7th meeting. One of the interventions was supported by 25 Member States.

All the speakers indicated, whether expressly or by implication, support for reform of the internal system of justice. The objective was described as that of putting in place a system that would be simple, open, efficient and expeditious. Several speakers referred to positive elements in the proposals. Among those mentioned were proposals to avoid problems through, inter alia, improvements in communications and exchanges of information; facilitation of resolution of problems prior to the litigation stage through, for instance, mediation and ombudsman procedures, appointments of an ombudsman coordinator and of a Legal Officer to the Panel of Counsel, improved review procedures, procedures for settlement of small claims, arrangements for specialist training and professionalization of the system.

Many of the critical comments related to the proposals to replace the Joint Appeals Board and the Joint Disciplinary Committee, although there was also support for them. The contention that participation of members elected by the staff to those bodies was a source of inefficiency and delay, because not enough staff members were available for the task and they frequently lacked the necessary capacity or objectivity, was disputed and the validity of that contention as a reason for replacing those bodies was rejected.

With regard to the proposal to replace the Joint Appeals Board by an arbitration board, it was contended that arbitration as a system depended on a background of equality between the parties. This was absent from the relations between the Administration and the staff in that, inter alia, the applicable rules and regulations were already determined; the procedure for choice of arbitrators was not evenly balanced, with consequent concerns about their independence and perceptions as to their impartiality; and the Secretary-General was responsible, under the Charter, for administrative and disciplinary decisions and accountable to the Member States in respect of them.

The proposal for arbitration boards was also criticized for other reasons. Serious doubts were expressed about the recruitment of arbitrators from outside the United Nations because they would lack the benefit of familiarity with the special regime pertaining to United Nations staff. The adequacy of a two section arbitration board to deal with the existing backlog of problems and to keep up to date with the regular flow of problems was raised and cost projections were questioned in that respect. Concern was also expressed as to whether there were adequate arrangements for legal representation of staff members. Delegations also drew attention to the reservations expressed by the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions with regard to the proposed arbitration board.

The proposal for replacement of the Joint Disciplinary Committee by a disciplinary board drew expressions of doubt about the desirability of the externally recruited arbitrators acting as chairpersons of the board. There was an objection to the proposal that staff members should be selected for the board, rather than elected, as was the case with the Committee.

It was suggested that the role of the Administrative Tribunal should also be considered in the context of the reform.

Some delegations favoured a general deferral of the reform proposals for reflection and further consultation with the staff. One delegation suggested by way of a counterproposal that the consultative processes should be strengthened so that consultation would precede administrative decisions and that the authority of the judgements of the Administrative Tribunal should be enhanced vis-à-vis the Administration by, inter alia, requiring qualifications for election as judges, defining the Tribunal's jurisdiction more clearly and extending the scope of the decisions available to it. There was no discussion on this proposal.

At the end of the debate, the Committee was addressed on the item by Mr. Luís de Posadas Montero, Senior Vice-President of the Administrative Tribunal.

UNITED
NATIONS

A

General Assembly

Distr.
GENERAL

A/C.6/51/8
12 November 1996

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

Fifty-first session
SIXTH COMMITTEE
Agenda item 114

PROGRAMME PLANNING

Programme 4 (Legal affairs) of the proposed medium-term plan for the period 1998-2001

Letter dated 12 November 1996 from the Chairman of the Sixth Committee to the President of the General Assembly

I wish to refer to the letter dated 26 September 1996 from the Chairman of the Fifth Committee (A/C.6/51/2) requesting the views of the Sixth Committee on programme 4 (Legal affairs) of the proposed medium-term plan for the period 1998-2001.

Having drawn the attention of the Sixth Committee and its various regional groups to this matter, I am attaching herewith the views transmitted to me by a number of States, namely, Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland (European Union), Costa Rica and Cuba.

(Signed) Ramón ESCOVAR-SALOM
Chairman
Sixth Committee of the
General Assembly

96-31457 (E) 121196 131196

Annex

VIEWS OF THE SIXTH COMMITTEE ON PROGRAMME 4 (LEGAL AFFAIRS) OF THE PROPOSED MEDIUM-TERM PLAN FOR THE PERIOD 1998-2001

Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Ireland Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Portugal, Spain, Sweden and United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland (European Union)

[Original: English]

[5 November 1996]

1. The European Union would like to reiterate what its representative indicated in this context in the Fifth Committee, that the promotion of justice and international law must be a priority objective for the United Nations. Subprogramme 4.3 is directly relevant to this objective. In this context, the Union would like to stress the importance of the efforts aimed at the establishment of an international criminal court. It believes that all possible support of the nature envisaged in paragraph 4.16 of the document is essential to secure the successful completion of this undertaking.

2. The European Union recalls that the President of the International Court of Justice, speaking in the General Assembly on 15 October 1996, on the occasion of the consideration of the Court's report, indicated that the financial situation of the Court was such that it seriously imperilled the very discharge of its duties by this principal judicial organ of the United Nations. He drew attention to the treatment of this question in chapter IV of the Court's report.

3. It is the strong view of the European Union that all necessary measures must be taken to ensure that the Court will have sufficient means to enable it to carry out its functions adequately in conformity with its rules of procedure, including those which require that the submissions of the parties are translated into the working languages of the Court. In this respect, it would appear unrealistic, in the light of the very limited resources allocated to the Court, to suggest that the funding of the requisite translation work can be met by internal redeployment. The European Union is of the belief that this situation is urgent and calls for appropriate budgetary measures.

4. In the context of subprogramme 4.1 (Overall direction, management and coordination of legal advice and services to the United Nations as a whole) the European Union refers to paragraph 4.9 and expresses its belief that the conclusion of status-of-forces agreements in connection with United Nations peacekeeping missions should be identified as an important objective of this subprogramme.

5. With regard to subprogramme 4.5, the European Union attaches particular importance to the objective set out in paragraph 4.29 to monitor the work of other international organizations active in international trade law so as to avoid duplication in their activities and to prevent inconsistencies in the results of their work.

6. The European Union refers to paragraph 4.4 (f) of document A/51/61 (Prog. 4) regarding the preparation of the Repertory of Practice of United Nations Organs and urges that the necessary steps be taken to ensure the timely publication of this document from now on and to eliminate the existing backlog in publication.

7. The European Union would also like to call the attention of the Fifth Committee to the sharp increase in the workload of the Office of Legal Affairs, which, despite maintaining virtually the same staffing level for 12 years, has had to deal with legal arrangements for peacekeeping operations, the setting up of the ad hoc war crimes tribunals, the servicing of an increasing number of meetings of various legal bodies and the computerization and updating of various publications, among many other new tasks (see A/51/6 (Prog. 4)).

8. Furthermore, the European Union expresses its concern about this situation, bearing in mind that this work is fundamental to the whole Organization and that the high quality with which it has been performed is due to the commitment and efficiency of the personnel of the Office of Legal Affairs.

Costa Rica

[Original: Spanish]

[5 November 1996]

1. Firstly, Costa Rica wishes to express its satisfaction at the initiation of the consultative process for the formulation of the medium-term plan, agreed in General Assembly resolution 41/213 of 19 December 1986, which, with the initiation of systematic consultations with sectoral and technical bodies of the United Nations, will allow the experts directly involved in programme implementation to give constructive expression to their views and for these views to be considered when making budgetary allocations.

2. With respect to the proposed medium-term plan, Costa Rica attaches the highest priority to the codification and progressive development of international law being undertaken by the United Nations. In this regard Costa Rica considers that subprogramme 4.3 should be strengthened. The availability of adequate resources for functions in support of activities relating to the codification of international law must be guaranteed. The broad availability of conference services is essential, in particular, to the preparatory work for an international criminal court and the work of the Sixth Committee. Support for International Law Commission activities must not, however, be reduced. Further, Costa Rica considers that assistance to developing countries in the form of grants, seminars and legal publications intended specifically for their nationals must be expanded.

3. The priority attached by Costa Rica to subprogramme 4.4 (Law of the sea and ocean affairs) is immediately below that accorded to subprogramme 4.3. Promotion of the universal acceptance of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea of 10 December 1982, and of the Agreement in implementation of the provisions of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea at

10 December 1982 on the conservation and management of straddling fish stocks and highly migratory fish stocks, as well as functions relating to advice, analysis and deposit of instruments, are essential to the proper maintenance of the legal regime for the seas and the proper utilization of their resources. Equally, it is of great importance to ensure the continued presence of the United Nations at meetings of States parties to the Convention, the International Seabed Authority and the International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea.

4. Costa Rica accords the next level of priority to subprogramme 4.6 (Custody, registration and publication of treaties). The function of depositary and information centre for treaties fulfilled by the United Nations is extremely useful to developing countries. In this regard the backlog in the issuance of treaties must be eliminated and more effective ways found of distributing information.

5. Lastly, Costa Rica views with concern the secondary role assigned to the activities of the International Court of Justice and the related Secretariat support. The Secretariat must give the greatest possible support to the work of the International Court of Justice and, if possible, promote and facilitate the use of this instrument in the peaceful settlement of disputes.

Cuba

[Original: English]

[11 November 1996]

1. Cuba considers that in the present international juncture the promotion, progressive development and further codification of international law must be priority objectives for the United Nations.

2. An overall objective of programme 4 should be to ensure the rule of law in and through the United Nations. We support the idea that, to this end, the provision of legal services to and liaison between Headquarters and United Nations organs, United Nations offices and field and peacekeeping missions, and the provision of assistance in the teaching, study, dissemination and wider appreciation of international law are of primary importance.

3. In the context of subprogramme 4.1 (Overall direction, management and coordination of legal advice and services to the United Nations as a whole), we advocate the continuing evolution of legal arrangements in support of United Nations efforts not only to maintain international peace and security but also to promote the social and economic development of all countries and the further codification of the right to development.

4. With regard to subprogramme 4.5, the Cuban delegation attaches particular importance to the objective of monitoring the work of international organizations active in international trade law. However, we consider that this monitoring task must be aimed at encouraging the work and contribution of those organizations to the progressive development and codification of international

trade law, and not the opposite, i.e., at imposing conditions to the implementation of the respective mandates and decisions taken by those organizations.

5. The Cuban delegation would also like to call the attention of the Fifth Committee to General Assembly resolution 44/23 of 17 November 1989, by which the United Nations Decade of International Law was proclaimed.

6. We are of the view that that resolution must be reaffirmed and that the Programme for the Decade in all its aspects, including the recommendation of holding a third international peace conference at the conclusion of the Decade on the occasion of the one hundredth anniversary of the first International Peace Conference, must be fully implemented, not only by seeking political commitments on the part of Member States to this objective, but also by means of an appropriate and timely allocation of the resources allocated to the Decade and its Programme in conformity with the mandate given by the enabling resolution.

7. Furthermore, the Cuban delegation would like to share the legitimate concern expressed by some delegations in the Sixth Committee regarding the current situation of the conference services allocated to the Committee, which have been subject to some irregularities that have directly affected the normal functioning and practice of this main Committee.

8. In view of these elements we reiterate the position expressed by our delegation at the first meeting of the Sixth Committee in which the programme of work for the fifty-first session was discussed. In our opinion, the proposed medium-term plan for the period 1998-2001 and its implications in the overall direction, management and coordination of the legal services in the United Nations system as a whole, as well as in the progressive development and codification of international law, should be subject to the necessary debate by Member States in the Sixth Committee.